32112

THE INFLUENCE OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM ON THE EXEGESIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN,

ON JANUARY 27, 1904,

BY

KIRSOPP LAKE.

Parker and Son,
27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD.
1904.

THE INFLUENCE OF TEXTUAL CRITICISM ON THE EXEGESIS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIDEN,

ON JANUARY 27, 1904,

BY

KIRSOPP LAKE.

Parker and Son,
27 BROAD-STREET, OXFORD.
1904.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/graduatetheologi00kirs

To the Curators, Professors, Doctors, and Students of the University, and to all others present.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Correct Exegesis and a correct appreciation of the date and character of the documents of early Christianity so largely depend on their text, and therefore on the results of textual criticism, that I think it is unnecessary for a teacher of exegesis to make any apology for emphasising the importance of the Textual Problem in the Gospels and making it the subject of an inaugural lecture.

It is not, perhaps, wrong to say that we are at the beginning of a new period in the Textual criticism of the Gospels.

In the 19th century the efforts of textual critics were directed constantly to the construction of the 'true text' of the Gospels, by an examination of the evidence contained principally in Greek MSS. and an attempt to classify it historically and genealogically.

The culminating point in this process was probably the great work of Westcott and Hort. This has two sides, a destructive and a constructive—the former successful, the latter a failure, though a splendid one.

The destructive side consisted in showing that the late ecclesiastical MSS. which form the basis of the *Textus Receptus* are of little value, representing conflations and selections from various earlier types of text.

The two great Cambridge scholars were completely successful in proving this. They then went on to the constructive side of their work, and taking the component part of the late text, which is best represented by codex Vaticanus, edited it as the 'Original Greek' of the New Testament.

In making this high claim for the Vatican MS. they have not been followed by later scholars. The reason for this is that authorities for the text have been studied in the form of versions and patristic quotations earlier than codex Vaticanus or than any Greek MSS., and it has been shown that that MS. probably does not do more than represent the text in use in Alexandria in the 3rd century. It is therefore regarded as probable that Westcott and Hort's text gives us the Alexandrian text of the 3rd century rather than the 'Original Greek' of the New Testament, and it appears equally probable that no amount of study of any Greek MSS. at present known to us will by itself ever give us anything better.

But if Westcott and Hort's constructive work was a failure, when judged by their own standard as implied in their title, it was one of those failures which are more important than most successes. They taught us how to reduce to order the un-

weildy mass of Greek MSS., and sketched the true use and value of the evidence of Versions and Fathers.

Indeed, it was this which enabled their successors to estimate properly the important discoveries and almost equally important editions of early versions, which marked the period immediately succeeding the publication of Westcott and Hort's text. Of these it is only necessary to mention Mrs. Lewis' and Mrs. Gibson's discovery and publication of a MS. of the Old Syriac version, and Professor Blass' use of Patristic quotations, which must always be a revelation to the student, however little he may agree with the theory based on it.

These discoveries and editions have paved the way for a general acceptance of the belief that we must abandon the method of basing the text primarily on the Greek MSS., and of regarding the Versions and Patristic quotations as possessing only secondary value.

It has become more and more probable that Greek MSS. as a whole [1] only represent one type of text and its corruptions, that the Latin Versions and Fathers represent another type, and the Syriac versions a third, while perhaps Clement of Alexandria may provide us with a fourth.

It is between these texts, and not between

[1] There are of course a few exceptions, such as D, the Ferrar group, and some others.

individual MSS., that we shall have in the last resort to judge, so that the situation which we must face is that we have to deal with a number of local texts, that no two localities used quite the same text, that no locality has yet been shown to have used a text which is demonstrably better than its rivals, and that no one of these local texts is represented in an uncorrupt form by any single MS.

The effect on the method of the textual critic is enormous. He has no longer the right to suggest that he can immediately edit the original text. He must go back and edit first the local texts. In the case of each locality he has the evidence of the versions used in the local church and of the writers who used them, but it is not very large, and in no case is without traces of corruption. Therefore, the student of these local texts is reduced to the level of the critic of classical texts. In the face of suspected corruption he has the right to use conjectural emendation. It used to be said that the classical student often needed to make use of conjectural emendation, because he had so few and so poor authorities for the text of his authors, but that the biblical student had no such need, because the MSS. of the New Testament were so numerous and so good that primitive corruption was almost unknown. The argument was reasonable, but when we recognize that in reality the text of the Gospels has not much better attestation than have some classical texts, the whole case is altered and

the textual critic must be conceded the right of as free emendation in the Gospels as in the Classics. Granted this freedom it will perhaps be possible some day to reconstruct the texts which were in use at the close of the second century in Africa, in Alexandria, in the East, and perhaps elsewhere. None of these have been yet reconstructed: all that we can say is that each as compared with any of the others presents a definite series of interpolations and a definite series of omissions.

This work of reconstructing local texts is the most important need of textual criticism at the present moment, and is the distinctive feature of the present period as compared with that of Westcott and Hort, which was primarily concerned with the Greek evidence alone. When it is finished, or as soon as its results begin to be fairly defined, it will be possible to move on a step further and try to reconstruct the text which lies behind all the local texts, that is to say, the text which was produced by the last editor of the Gospels. It is too early to attempt to say much about the character which this text will assume: but personally I believe that we shall find that some corruptions have attached themselves to all local texts, or to almost all, and that it will therefore be impossible to reconstruct the underlying text by any mechanical method. Especially is this likely to be the case with doctrinal corruptions.

Let me give one instance of this,—a remarkable

discovery of Mr. Conybeare, which I am the more desirous to mention because it has not as yet aroused the interest which it deserves, and indeed has been somewhat neglected by the leading English Theological papers, with the exception of the *Hibbert Journal*.

The facts as they were first published by Mr. Conybeare in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, and more recently in the *Hibbert Journal* i, 1, are that Eusebius quotes Mt. 28, 19 at least eighteen times in the form, *Go ye into all the world and make disciples of all nations in my name*, omitting all reference to baptism. For instance, in the *Demonstratio Evangelica* iii. 7, he says, *Christ did not enjoin them to 'make disciples of all the nations' simply and without qualification, but with the necessary addition of 'in his name.'*

Riggenbach has increased the eighteen passages to twenty-five, in which Eusebius quotes Mt. 28, 19, either with the addition "in my name," or in the simpler form ending at the word "nations," but there are three passages in which Eusebius quotes the usual text. Two of these are found in the writings against Marcellus, which some further investigations of Mr. Conybeare, published in the *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, iv. 4, p. 330, show to be wrongly attributed to Eusebius of Cæsarea. Another is in the letter of Eusebius to his Church, which is preserved by Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* i. 8, and the

fourth is in the *Commentary on the Psalms*, Ps. 117, 1—4.

I do not feel at all sure that the reading in these two passages is so far above suspicion as to justify the statement that Eusebius knew the traditional text. But in any case that is not the essential point. The really important thing is we can show that Eusebius of Cæsarea, living in one of the greatest Christian libraries of the fourth century, knew Mt. 28, 19, not in the traditional text, but in a form which omitted the command to baptize in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Moreover, as Mr. Conybeare has shown good reason for thinking that Aphraates of Nisibis and Justin Martyr were ignorant of the usual reading, he has made out an excellent case for thinking that the words in Mt. 28, 19, *Baptising them in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost*, are an interpolation in the text of the Gospel, which, he suggests, was perhaps made in Africa.

As I said, this discovery has not met with the attention it deserves, and it is remarkable that anything which throws something more than suspicion on the genuineness of the great proof text for the institution of Baptism should have been received by conservative Theologians with silence, rather than refutation.

Now, the importance of such a discovery for the textual critic is twofold.

(1.) It has the direct importance that it probably

enables him to edit the original text of Mt. 28, 19, without these words, and somewhat less certainly to regard them as an interpolation which first invaded the African local text and afterwards spread to others, though when and how is doubtful. For it is surely incredible that Eusebius always quoted the passage wrongly by accident, and even more incredible that the words were left out on purpose. Baptismal custom would secure the insertion of the words: nothing known to history[1] would account for their omission, for it must be remembered that this is not the only baptismal text which has been shown to be due to interpolation, or to add details drawn from ecclesiastical use. Another example may be found in Mc. 16, 16, which is quoted in all the old books as a proof text of the institution of Baptism, but is part of the now admittedly spurious conclusion of the second gospel; and a third instance is the account of the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch, where an early interpolation, the locality of which is doubtful, inserts a demand for a confession of faith as a preliminary to baptism.

(2.) It shows that in doctrinal modifications of the text, which are almost sure to be very early, it is vain to ask for much MS. evidence. The actual MSS. of the Gospels are all later than the period when changes of this kind were made, and the quotations of the Fathers, even when not carelessly

[1] The suggestion that it is due to the Disciplina Arcana seems a counsel of despair.

made, are often obscured by corruptions within their own text, especially owing to the tendency of scribes and editors to correct patristic quotations by the norm of their own Bibles. So that quite a small amount of evidence is sufficient to establish the claim to consideration of readings which are likely to have been obnoxious to early doctrine, and probably we may even say that, at least in attempting to reconstruct the text which lies behind the local texts, we ought sometimes to regard with suspicion readings against which we can produce no external testimony, but only contextual unsuitability, and to be prepared to give a tolerant hearing to the claims of conjectural emendation in such cases.

Instead, therefore, of working with a single Greek text which has a few various readings at the bottom of the page, the scholar of the future, as soon as the textualists have supplied him with the material, must use, in the first place, a series of local texts, differing in many important readings, and in the second, a reconstructed original text, which cannot be proved to have been used by any definite Church, but which must lie behind and explain all the local texts.

This will undoubtedly affect his work, both as an exegete and as a student of the early Christian literature.

The task of the exegete will, in many cases, be made more complicated.

In the first place, he will need to expound the meaning, not of Westcott and Hort's text, but

of the ecclesiastical Bibles in use at different times; for I take it that to explain what a passage in the Gospels ought philologically to mean, or what it probably did mean originally, is only the beginning of exegesis: we need to know what the early Church thought it meant and how it altered its wording in order to emphasize its meaning. For instance, in the example taken just now from Mt. 28, 19 the exegetical value of the baptismal gloss is the proof which it affords that the early Church in the West interpreted the command to make disciples as implying the baptism of all converts, whereas it is probable that in the Church to which Aphraates belonged this implication was not made, and the modern exegete has therefore to recognise and judge between these two interpretations. Moreover, in such a passage as this, the exegete is scarcely justified in assuming that the textual theory of Mr. Conybeare is beyond question. He ought certainly to give it the fullest possible weight as the most probable view,—if he agree with me that it is so,—but it is not so generally accepted that he can ignore the claims to a statement of a more traditional exegesis. An exegete has no right to assume the soundness or reverse of a reading on which textual critics differ, even though he happen to be a textual critic himself. If we wish to help on learning we must point out in every case how far our exegesis depends on textual questions, and how far it has to be left uncertain because of doubts as to the text.

But this is not all. It is admitted that sound exegesis cannot treat single passages as though they stood by themselves, but must take them in connection with similar passages; if, therefore, the text of these other passages is modified by criticism, the exegesis, and probably also the textual criticism, of the first passage is also altered.

As an example of what I mean let me take a text which must be treated differently in consequence of the changed attitude which we are obliged to adopt towards Mt. 28, 20—I mean Jo. 3, 5.

Many Protestant exegetes have found themselves inclined to think that this verse really refers to spiritual regeneration alone, and that the reference to water in it does not imply that the material water in baptism is the instrument, as it were, by which that regeneration is accomplished. On the other hand, other exegetes who have been themselves less swayed by doctrinal considerations have asserted that the phrase "by water and spirit" can only refer to baptism.

Such a difference of exegesis is almost always due to a deep-seated difficulty to which full justice is not done by either school of thought. There can be but little doubt that there is in the passage as it stands a *prima facie* reference to baptism. But it is also true that if it were not for the three words "of water and" in verse 5, there would be nothing to show that this reference is intended, and that in the following verses, which are a kind

of explanation of verse 3, nothing suggests that water has ever been mentioned.

If it had not been shown in the cases of Mt. 28, 19, and of Mc. 16, 16, that there was a tendency in quite early times to insert into the text of the Gospels, references to baptism as directly enjoined by Christ this difficulty would remain, for in the face of such texts as Mt. 28, 19, no exegete would have a right to go behind the tradition of the Church which connects regeneration with baptism. This surely remains true whether we think that all the four gospels represent faithfully the teaching of Christ, or that they are rather the tradition of the next generation about Him, for in either case the Synoptic gospels and the 4th gospel cannot be widely separated in date, and if we find references to Baptism as an ordinance of Christ in the Synoptic gospels, we need not be surprised to find them in St. John.

But, in the light of the fact that both the places in the Synoptic gospels in which Baptism is represented as ordained by Christ are quite probably spurious, our relation to the passage in St. John is altered.

Since we have found signs of a tendency on the part of the editors of the text to bring in references to Baptism, and to exalt the necessity of that Sacrament, in two out of three traditional proof texts for baptism, we have to face the question whether it is not possible that something of the same kind has happened in the third,

and that the original text was simply *Except a man be born of the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.* Are there any signs that this is the case ?

Now, it is scarcely fair to insist on purely manuscriptal evidence. The directions in which it is reasonable to explore are more widespread. Let us examine some of them.

(1.) In order that we may see how far a reference to Baptism is necessary, we must consider the general argument of the passage, and see whether it seems on the one hand to be implied, or on the other to be intrusive.

I have already said that the words *of water and,* on which depends the reference to Baptism, have apparently but little connection with what follows, and this impression is strengthened by a closer examination. Putting aside the words under discussion we may say that in the discourse with Nicodemus, Christ was explaining that the Kingdom of God can only be entered by a change in the life of man, which makes him no longer primarily material, but primarily spiritual and only secondarily material. This change was compared to birth, and as Nicodemus did not understand the meaning of the comparison, an explanation was given. That explanation is first set out in verse 5, and then is expanded and made more plain in the following verses, ending with the phrase, *so is everyone that is born of the Spirit,* the antithesis throughout being the usual

one between Flesh and Spirit, or, in Professor James' phrase, between the *once-born* and the *twice-born.*

We should therefore expect to find an agreement between the saying in its original form, the explanation in verse 5, and the expansion in the following verses. Accordingly, when we find that there is nothing about water, and therefore nothing about Baptism, either in the original saying in verse 3, or in the final expansion, but only in the intermediate explanation in verse 5, we are obliged to confess that the passage would be easier, and would yield a more consistent sense if the words *of water and* could be omitted from verse 5, so that the passage would run as was suggested above, *Except a man be born of the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of Heaven.*

(2.) Let us now take examples of another kind of evidence—that afforded by the treatment of the text of this, and of neighbouring verses, by Ecclesiastical writers, for it will be valuable to know whether there are any signs that early writers were in the habit of altering other words in Jo. 3, in order to bring out more plainly the supposed references to Baptism. An examination of this point is needed, because it is not altogether sufficient to show that passages elsewhere in the Gospels have been interpolated in the interests of Baptismal Doctrine. We ought to be able to find traces of similar manipulation of the present text, not perhaps sufficient to show directly that

the words in verse 5 are an addition, but at least that the tendency, which, it is suggested, did alter that verse, can be proved to have been at work in the neighbourhood. If we can find such traces we must admit the possibility that the process which we can thus see is only a continuation of what had begun earlier (so early, in fact, that it has removed all definite manuscriptal signs of the earlier text), for there is no reason for thinking that the Church of the 2nd century was more conservative in its preservation of the text than was that of the following ages.

Now, a glance at Tischendorf's critical edition of the text will serve to show that this manipulation can easily be proved without any independent research. For instance, in the Apostolic Constitutions[1], we are told *the Lord says, except a man be baptized with water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the Kingdom, &c.*, in which the process of manipulation has been carried to such an extreme, that the idea of regeneration has been completely lost, at least in name, in order to emphasize the need of Baptism.

Or, again, in the Clementine Homilies[2] we read, *For so the prophet bade us, saying, Verily, I say to you, except ye be born again in running* (lit. *living*) *water, in the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven.* The writer has been so anxious to justify the ecclesiastical use of running or living

[1] Const. vi. 15, 3. [2] Clem. Homil. 11, 26.

water as distinct from cistern water, and of the Trinitarian formula, that he has actually forgotten to mention the spiritual side of the second birth at all!

But perhaps more really important than either of these instances is the fact that Hilary, supported by the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions as well as the Sinaitic Codex, quotes verse 8 with the insertion of the words "of water and." Textually this is very strong evidence, but editors have rightly agreed in condemning the words as an interpolation. There could hardly be better proof that early writers were capable of inserting a reference to water where none was to be found in the original text, if they thought that they could improve it by so doing, and it is evidence for an early perception of the fact that verses 5 and 8 ought textually to correspond.

It is therefore to be admitted that our knowledge of the way in which this section of the 4th gospel was treated by early writers supports the suggestion that the allusion to baptism in verse 5 is an interpolation.

(3.) It is now perhaps possible to go on to look for more direct evidence, since to some minds it will certainly seem improper to admit that contextual unsuitability and a known doctrinal tendency can ever be sufficient grounds for emending a text against which no direct testimony can be adduced, and it is therefore necessary to ask whether it is really true that all such evidence is wanting. I

am prepared to admit that there is no convincing evidence, none that is to say which would be worth long consideration if it were not for the other facts which I have brought forward, but I think that there is one piece of evidence which may be fairly classified as direct. This is the evidence of Justin Martyr, supposing it to be true that he knew the fourth gospel, and I think that the balance of evidence is in favour of this theory.

In the sixty-first chapter of the first Apology, he gives a description [1] of the regeneration of converts, which he associates with baptism in the name of the Trinity. He then goes on to give his reasons. For the fact and the necessity of regeneration he says [2], *For Christ said, Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.* For the act of baptism as cleansing away sins he quotes [3] Isaiah 1, 16—20, and for the Trinitarian

[1] Ὃν τρόπον δὲ καὶ ἀνεθήκαμεν ἑαυτοὺς τῷ θεῷ καινοποιηθέντες διὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐξηγησόμεθα, ὅπως μὴ τοῦτο παραλιπόντες δόξωμεν πονηρεύειν τι ἐν τῇ ἐξηγήσει. Ὅσοι ἂν πεισθῶσι καὶ πιστεύωσι ἀληθῆ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ' ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα καὶ λεγόμενα εἶναι, καὶ βιοῦν οὕτως δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, εὔχεσθαί τε καὶ αἰτεῖν νηστεύοντες παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν προημαρτημένων ἄφεσιν διδάσκονται, ἡμῶν συνευχομένων καὶ συννηστευόντων αὐτοῖς. Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστί, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται· ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται.

[2] Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· Ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἀδύνατον εἰς τὰς μήτρας τῶν τεκουσῶν τοὺς ἅπαξ γεννωμένους ἐμβῆναι, φανερὸν πᾶσίν ἐστι.

[3] Καὶ διὰ Ἡσαίου τοῦ προφήτου, ὡς προεγράψαμεν, εἴρηται, τίνα τρόπον φεύξονται τὰς ἁμαρτίας οἱ ἁμαρτήσαντες καὶ μετανοοῦντες, κ.τ.λ.

formula he quotes[1] tradition. I suggest that he quotes the words of Christ, where he knew them to be apposite, as the strongest reasons which Christians could have, Isaiah and tradition where the words of Christ were not explicit. I believe, therefore, that the balance of probability is that Justin Martyr's text of the New Testament did not contain any reference to water in Jo. 3, 5, or to the Trinitarian formula in Mt. 28, 19. The argument is of course merely the dangerous one from silence, but it is an extremely powerful example, especially in the former case, for it cannot fairly be said that Justin probably forgot the existence of Jo. 3, 5, seeing that he seems to make use of verses 3 and 4. If he had known verse 5 in the traditional form it would have been exactly what he needed to prove the connection of baptism with regeneration; whereas if he knew it only in a form which omitted the reference to baptism, it added nothing to verse 3, of which it is in the Gospel the explanation, and his falling back on Isaiah as his authority for regarding baptism as a means of regeneration is natural and explicable.

Influenced therefore by the probably spurious character of the baptismal formula in Mt. 28, 19, as shown by the direct evidence of Eusebius, I incline to the belief that it will be no longer safe for any exegete of Jo. 3, 5 to neglect the possi-

[1] Καὶ λόγον δὲ εἰς τοῦτο παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐμάθομεν τοῦτον, κ.τ.λ.

bility that the reference to baptism, based on the mention of water in verse 5 may be due to an already recognised tendency in the early church to insert such allusions, and he will be bound to give some attention to the kind of evidence which I have adduced as pointing to the original existence of a different text.

If the task of the exegete is likely to be modified by the developments of textual criticism, the same is not less true of the work of the student of early Christian literature. The investigator of the Synoptic problem will perhaps find that some at least of the smaller points in the Gospels which have troubled him will disappear, and it will probably be found that the dating of the various documents of primitive Christianity has been rendered somewhat more easy, and to entail somewhat less complicated theories as to their history. Perhaps it may even be said that the more drastic criticism which the text of the Gospels is likely to receive in the future will in the end result in a somewhat wider acceptance of dates more nearly approximating to the traditional ones.

For instance, it has been stated that the existence in Mt. 28, 19 of a more developed baptismal formula than is used in the Acts proves that the Gospel is the later work. Without wishing at all to raise the question whether on other grounds this is so or not, it is at least plain that if Mr. Conybeare's discovery as to the text of the Gospel be accepted, it removes this particular argument

from those who argue for the posteriority of that document. I cannot repress the hopes that it may be possible that in this way textual criticism will in the end act as a means of reconciling those who have maintained the lateness of the Gospels because of special features, with those who have held to an earlier date because of their general characteristics.

But it is in his efforts to understand the meaning and influence of the documents on which he has to work that the student will probably find most valuable the textual apparatus with which he will be provided. By means of the new information given him he will be able to make local texts, local customs, and local doctrines explain each other. For instance, when he finds that Aphraates probably did not read the injunction to baptize in his copy of Mt. 28, 19, and certainly did not know that baptism was regarded as necessary to salvation in Mc. 16, 16, he will be better able to understand such a passage as Aphraates vii. 20 (made well known by Mr. Burkitt's lectures), where baptism is shown to have been the privilege of monks, rather than the seal of all Christians in the Church of Edessa.

Yet it is not only local but also catholic customs and doctrines which will have to be reviewed in the light of textual criticism. We shall have to consider, for instance, in the case of the catholic custom and doctrine of Baptism how far it is really based on the interpolated (if it be

interpolated), text of Mt. 28, 19, and how far it is independent. That baptism is a primitive and catholic custom is beyond question. It has been usual to trace the origin of that custom to Christ's commands as reported in Mt. 28, 19, and Mc. 16, 16. If textual criticism really[1] makes it doubtful that those passages are part of the original text, then it is clearly the duty of the student of early Christian literature to ask whether there is any other evidence that baptism was ordained by Christ, and whether the suggestion is not worth consideration that baptism was a Jewish custom, sanctioned by Christ as an initiatory ceremony, and regarded by the early Church as a necessary and essential rite. For my own part I have no wish to prejudge this question, but it seems to me to be one of some moment, on which we need to hear more evidence, and to have discussed from more than one point of view. It is in the belief that it is typical of the kind of problems which textual criticism is beginning to present to exegetes and historians, and that this presentment is a matter of considerable importance to more than merely technical scholarship that I have ventured to draw your attention to it in my inaugural lecture.

[1] I hesitate to assume that Mr. Conybeare's discovery has really done so until a somewhat longer lapse of time show that the leaders of conservative theology have really no answer to give to his arguments.

To the Curators of the University.

To you, gentlemen, who are Curators of this famous University, I must most sincerely express my sense of the great honour which you did me in submitting my name to her Majesty the Queen of Holland for a Professorship on your ancient foundation. Allow me to assure you that I am most grateful for the distinguished position which your favour has bestowed upon me, for I am well aware that this University must always rank among the most famous in Europe, as well for the great scholars and eminent men that it has produced, as for its illustrious founder, William the Silent, the Father of his country and the most distinguished member of that great House of Orange to which Holland and Great Britain alike owe so much. At the same time, I am by no means insensible to the many responsibilities which I have accepted, and I promise that so far as my strength and ability may serve, I shall endeavour to fulfill them faithfully.

To the Professors of the University.

To the Professors of the University I come as a stranger from a foreign land, but already in the few days that I have been in Leiden I feel that I have been so welcomed, that I understand as I never understood before how truly the world of

learning knows no distinctions of nationality, and does not regard the accident of birth.

I could never have accepted the high position which was offered me, had it not been that the letters of Professor Pijper, the President of the Theological Faculty, followed by those of all the other members, had shown me that I should be welcomed by the Professors of the Theological Faculty, not merely with courtesy, but with real friendship and a readiness to help even at great expense of their own time.

I now know that the impression which I formed from letters was just, for I have already experienced the greatest kindness from every member of the Faculty ; I feel sure that whatever mistakes I shall make in my new life will not be due to any lack of help from them, and moreover I am confident that, when I do make mistakes, as it is certain that I must, they will both tell me of my error and be prepared to make allowance for the imperfection of our common humanity, and for the necessary limitations which must at first somewhat straitly confine the efforts of a foreigner.

At the present moment I am conscious that I am beginning a new period of my life, which, though rendered serious by responsibility, is certainly fraught with many happy opportunities, yet I am not unconscious that the inevitable touch of melancholy which is present in all human affairs is not absent. It is a sincere grief to me, as I know that it is to the whole learned world, that Prof.

van Manen should have vacated his chair, not in the fulness of a ripe age, but at a time when he might have expected, and others hoped, that for many years he would be able to investigate, and to teach the meaning and the history of the literature which he loves.

Let me assure the Professors of the University as a whole, that however diverse may be the subjects which we teach or the methods which we employ, I recognize fully that in the end we have all one object in view.

We have the common desire to make our pupils better men and more useful citizens than they would otherwise be. It is a very little thing that a man should learn something about certain special subjects before he leave the shelter of the University for the more strenuous life of the world, but it is a very great thing that he should take with him that reverence for truth, because it is truth, and for right, because it is right, which is the foundation of all permanently successful work, whether it be in literature, in politics, or in any other career.

To the Students of the University.

Finally let me assure the Students of the University of my desire to help on in whatever way I may be able their studies in preparation for their high vocation as ministers of the gospel

of Christ. I am very sorry, that for a few months I shall be much handicapped by my inability to use their language, but I hope that by next September, I shall be in a position to lecture in Dutch, at least partially, even though it may be necessary to apologise for frequent solecisms, and for an imperfect pronunciation.

There is no tradition more constant at Oxford than that of friendship between Tutors and Pupils, and I believe that the same is also true of Leiden. My sincere hope is to make many valuable friendships, as well among the junior as the senior members of this ancient home of scholarship, and to do my utmost, both by learning and by teaching, to be worthy of a position which has been filled by so many of those whose fame has been established by the impartial verdict of history.

Printed by James Parker and Co., Crown Yard, Oxford.